

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/778,527	02/07/2001	Hideo Morimoto	11A 3067	3179
7:	590 08/26/2003			
Koda & Androlia Suite 3850 2029 Century Park East			EXAMINER	
			NGUYEN, CHANH DUY	
Los Angeles, C	A 90067-3024		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBE	
			2675	8
			DATE MAILED: 08/26/2003	0

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

þ

	(//
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/778,527	MORIMOTO ET AL	U
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Chanh Nguyen	2675	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	opears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence addr	ess
THE REPLY FILED 07 August 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of App Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	avoid abandonment of this appli (1) a timely filed amendment wh	cation. A proper reply ich places the applicat	to a tion in
PERIOD FOR	REPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing of	•		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of the no event, however, will the statutory period for reply exp ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY W 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a).	ire later than SIX MONTHS from the mai VAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF	ling date of the final rejection. THE FINAL REJECTION.	on. See MPEP
fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the perice under 37 CFR 1.136(a). fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the climely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 3	od of extension and the corresponding are of the shortened statutory period for rep Office later than three months after the m	mount of the fee. The appro ly originally set in the final (opriate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellar 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.192(a)).			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	d because:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require full	rther consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Not	e below);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the applicatio issues for appeal; and/or	n in better form for appeal by ma	terially reducing or sim	nplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cand	celing a corresponding number of	f finally rejected claims	3 .
NOTE:			
3. \square Applicant's reply has overcome the following rej	ection(s):		
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) woo canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	uld be allowable if submitted in a	separate, timely filed a	amendment
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request application in condition for allowance because:		sidered but does NOT	place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered by raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ecause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were	newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims			nd an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follow	/s:		
Claim(s) allowed: 2 and 4.			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1 and 3</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on	is a) approved or b) disar	oproved by the Examir	ner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Staten		_	
10.☐ Other: _	(7)		
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		$f \Lambda = \Lambda$	

Chanh Nguyen Primary Examiner Art Unit: 2675



Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the arguments presented by applicant are not persuasive since all the limitation recited in claims 1 and 3 are met by Zimmerman in view of Shimada as set forht in the rejection. For example, on page 4, lines 12-13, applicant argues that applicant's invention is utilized a solder which is electrically highly conductive, but claim 1 is so broad that it does not even recite the limitation "conductive" solder as applicant's argument. In view of argument to claims 2 and 4, these claims are allowable.